Near-Linear Time Constant-Factor Approximation Algorithm for Branch-Decomposition of Planar Graphs[1]

Qian-Ping Gu and Gengchun Xu
School of Computing Science, Simon Fraser University
Burnaby BC Canada V5A1S6
qgu@cs.sfu.ca,gxa2@sfu.ca

arXiv:1407.6761v2 [cs.DS] 31 Mar 2015

Abstract: We give an algorithm which for an input planar graph G of n vertices and integer k, in $\min\{O(n\log^3 n), O(nk^2)\}$ time either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$, $\delta > 0$ is a constant, or a $(k+1)\times\lceil\frac{k+1}{2}\rceil$ cylinder minor of G implying $\mathrm{bw}(G) > k$, $\mathrm{bw}(G)$ is the branchwidth of G. This is the first $\tilde{O}(n)$ time constant-factor approximation for branchwidth/treewidth and largest grid/cylinder minors of planar graphs and improves the previous $\min\{O(n^{1+\epsilon}), O(nk^3)\}$ ($\epsilon > 0$ is a constant) time constant-factor approximations. For a planar graph G and $k = \mathrm{bw}(G)$, a branch-decomposition of width at most $(2+\delta)k$ and a $g\times\frac{g}{2}$ cylinder/grid minor with $g = \frac{k}{\beta}$, $\beta > 2$ is constant, can be computed by our algorithm in $\min\{O(n\log^3 n\log k), O(nk^2\log k)\}$ time.

Key words: Branch-/tree-decompositions, grid minor, planar graphs, approximation algorithm.

1 Introduction

The notions of branchwidth and branch-decomposition introduced by Robertson and Seymour [28] in relation to the notions of treewidth and tree-decomposition have important algorithmic applications. The branchwidth $\mathrm{bw}(G)$ and the treewidth $\mathrm{tw}(G)$ of graph G are linearly related: $\max\{\mathrm{bw}(G), 2\} \leq \mathrm{tw}(G)+1 \leq \max\{\lfloor\frac{3}{2}\mathrm{bw}(G)\rfloor, 2\}$ for every G with more than one edge, and there are simple translations between branch-decompositions and tree-decompositions that meet the linear relations [28]. A graph G of small branchwidth (treewidth) admits efficient algorithms for many NP-hard problems [2, 7]. These algorithms first compute a branch-/tree-decomposition of G and then apply a dynamic programming algorithm based on the decomposition to solve the problem. The dynamic programming step usually runs in polynomial time in the size of G and exponential time in the width of the branch-/tree-decomposition computed.

Deciding the branchwidth/treewidth and computing a branch-/tree-decomposition of minimum width have been extensively studied. For an arbitrary graph G of n vertices, the following results have been known: Given an integer k, it is NP-complete to decide whether $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq k$ [31] ($\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq k$ [1]). If $\mathrm{bw}(G)$ ($\mathrm{tw}(G)$) is upper-bounded by a constant then both the decision problem and the optimal decomposition problem can be solved in

[1] A preliminary version of this paper appeared in the Proceedings of the 40th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG2014) [21].

$O(n)$ time [10, 8]. However, the linear time algorithms are mainly of theoretical importance because the constant behind the Big-Oh is huge. The best known polynomial time approximation factor is $O(\sqrt{\mathrm{bw}(G)})$ for branchwidth and $O(\sqrt{\log \mathrm{tw}(G)})$ for treewidth [15]. The best known exponential time approximation factors are as follows: an algorithm giving a branch-decomposition of width at most $3\mathrm{bw}(G)$ in $2^{O(\mathrm{bw}(G))}n^2$ time [29]; an algorithm giving a tree-decomposition of width at most $3\mathrm{tw}(G)+4$ in $2^{O(\mathrm{bw}(G))}n \log n$ time [6]; and an algorithm giving a tree-decomposition of width at most $5\mathrm{tw}(G)+4$ in $2^{O(\mathrm{tw}(G))}n$ time [6]. By the linear relation between the branchwidth and treewidth, the algorithms for tree-decompositions are also algorithms of same approximation factors for branch-decompositions, while from a branchwidth approximation α, a treewidth approximation 1.5α can be obtained.

Better results have been known for planar graphs G. Seymour and Thomas show that whether $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq k$ can be decided in $O(n^2)$ time and an optimal branch-decomposition of G can be computed in $O(n^4)$ time [31]. Gu and Tamaki improve the $O(n^4)$ time for the optimal branch-decomposition to $O(n^3)$ [18]. By the linear relation between the branchwidth and treewidth, the above results imply polynomial time 1.5-approximation algorithms for the treewidth and optimal tree-decomposition of planar graphs. It is open whether deciding $\mathrm{tw}(G) \leq k$ is NP-complete or polynomial time solvable for planar graphs G.

Fast algorithms for computing small width branch-/tree-decompositions of planar graphs have received much attention as well. Tamaki gives an $O(n)$ time heuristic algorithm for branch-decomposition [33]. Gu and Tamaki give an algorithm which for an input planar graph G of n vertices and integer k, either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(c+1+\delta)k$ or outputs $\mathrm{bw}(G) > k$ in $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}})$ time, where c is any fixed positive integer and $\delta > 0$ is a constant [19]. By this algorithm and a binary search, a branch-decomposition of width at most $(c+1+\delta)k$ can be computed in $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}} \log k)$ time, $k = \mathrm{bw}(G)$. Recently, Kammer and Tholey give an algorithm which for input G and k, either constructs a tree-decomposition of G with width at most $(9+\delta)k$, $\delta > 0$ is a constant, or outputs $\mathrm{tw}(G) > k$ in $O(nk^3)$ time [24, 25]. This implies that a tree-decomposition of width at most $(9+\delta)k$ can be computed in $O(nk^3 \log k)$ time, $k = \mathrm{tw}(G)$. Computational study on branch-decomposition can be found in [3, 4, 5, 22, 23, 32, 33]. Fast constant-factor approximation algorithms for branch-/tree-decompositions of planar graphs have important applications such as that in shortest distance oracles in planar graphs [26].

Grid minor of graphs is another notion in graph minor theory [30]. A $k \times k$ grid is a Cartesian product of two paths, each on k vertices. For a graph G, let $\mathrm{gm}(G)$ be the largest integer k such that G has a $k \times k$ grid as a minor. Computing a large grid minor of a graph is important in algorithmic graph minor theory and bidimensionality theory [13, 14, 30]. It is shown in [30] that $\mathrm{gm}(G) \leq \mathrm{bw}(G) \leq 4\mathrm{gm}(G)$ for planar graphs. Gu and Tamaki improve the linear bound $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq 4\mathrm{gm}(G)$ to $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq 3\mathrm{gm}(G)$ and show that for any $a < 2$, $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq a\mathrm{gm}(G)$ does not hold for planar graphs [20]. Other studies on grid minor size and branchwidth/treewidth of planar graphs can be found in [9, 17]. The upper bound $\mathrm{bw}(G) \leq 3\mathrm{gm}(G)$ is a consequence of a result on cylinder minors. A $k \times h$ cylinder is a Cartesian product of a cycle on k vertices and a path on h vertices. For a graph G, let $\mathrm{cm}(G)$ be the largest integer k such that G has a $k \times \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$ cylinder as a minor. It is shown

in [20] that $\mathrm{cm}(G) \leq \mathrm{bw}(G) \leq 2\mathrm{cm}(G)$ for planar graphs. The $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}})$ time algorithm in [19] actually constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(c+1+\delta)k$ or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor.

We propose an $\tilde{O}(n)$ time constant-factor approximation algorithm for branch-/tree-decompositions of planar graphs. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1 *There is an algorithm which given a planar graph G of n vertices and an integer k, in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n), O(nk^2)\}$ time either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$, $\delta > 0$ is a constant, or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G.*

Since a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder has branchwidth at least $k+1$ [20], a cylinder minor given in Theorem 1 implies $\mathrm{bw}(G) > k$.

By the linear relation between the branchwidth and treewidth, Theorem 1 implies an algorithm which for an input planar graph G and integer k, in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n), O(nk^2)\}$ time constructs a tree-decomposition of G with width at most $(3+\delta)k$ or outputs $\mathrm{tw}(G) > k$. For a planar graph G and $k = \mathrm{bw}(G)$, by Theorem 1 and a binary search, a branch-decomposition of width at most $(2+\delta)k$ can be computed in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n \log k), O(nk^2 \log k)\}$ time. This improves the previous result of a branch-decomposition of width at most $(c+1+\delta)k$ in $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}} \log k)$ time [19]. Similarly, for a planar graph G and $k = \mathrm{tw}(G)$, a tree-decomposition of width at most $(3+\delta)k$ can be computed in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n \log k), O(nk^2 \log k)\}$ time, improving the previous result of a tree-decomposition of width at most $(9+\delta)k$ in $O(nk^3 \log k)$ time [24, 25]. Our algorithm can also be used to compute a $g \times \lceil \frac{g}{2} \rceil$ cylinder (grid) minor with $g = \frac{\mathrm{bw}(G)}{\beta}$, $\beta > 2$ is a constant, and a $g \times g$ cylinder (grid) minor with $g = \frac{\mathrm{bw}(G)}{\beta}$, $\beta > 3$ is a constant, of G in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n \log k), O(nk^2 \log k)\}$ time. This improves the previous results of $g \times \lceil \frac{g}{2} \rceil$ with $g \geq \frac{\mathrm{bw}(G)}{\beta}$, $\beta > (c+1)$, and $g \times g$ with $g \geq \frac{\mathrm{bw}(G)}{\beta}$, $\beta > (2c+1)$, in $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}} \log k)$ time. As an application, our algorithm removes a bottleneck in the work of [26] for computing a shortest path oracle and reduces its preprocessing time in Theorem 6.1 from $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}} \log k \log n + S \log^2 n)$ to $O(\min\{O(n \log^4 n \log k), O(nk^2 \log n \log k)\} + S \log^2 n)$.

Our algorithm for Theorem 1 uses the approach in the previous work of [19] described below. Given a planar graph G and integer k, let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the set of biconnected components of G with a normal distance (a definition is given in the next section) $h = ak$, $a > 0$ is a constant, from a selected edge e_0 of G. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, a minimum vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ which partitions $E(G)$ into edge subsets A_Z and $\overline{A}_Z = E(G) \setminus A_Z$ is computed such that $Z \subseteq A_Z$ and $e_0 \in \overline{A}_Z$ ($\partial(A_Z)$ separates Z and e_0). If $|\partial(A_Z)| > k$ for some $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ then $\mathrm{bw}(G) > k$ is concluded. Otherwise, a branch-decomposition of graph H obtained from G by removing all A_Z is constructed. For each subgraph $G[A_Z]$ induced by A_Z, a branch-decomposition is constructed or $\mathrm{bw}(G[A_Z]) > k$ is concluded recursively. Finally, a branch-decomposition of G with width $O(k)$ is constructed from the branch-decomposition of H and those of $G[A_Z]$ or $\mathrm{bw}(G) > k$ is concluded.

The algorithm in [19] computes a minimum vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ in all recursive steps in $O(n^{1+\frac{1}{c}})$ time. Our main idea for proving Theorem 1 is based on recent results for computing minimum face separating cycles and vertex-cut sets in planar graphs

to find a minimum vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ more efficiently. Borradaile et al. give an algorithm which in $O(n \log^4 n)$ time computes an oracle for the all pairs minimum face separating cycle problem in a planar graph G [12]. The time for computing the oracle is further improved to $O(n \log^3 n)$ [11]. For any pair of faces f and g in G, the oracle in $O(|C|)$ time returns a minimum (f, g)-separating cycle C (C cuts the sphere on which G is embedded into two regions, one contains f and the other contains g). By this result, we show that a minimum vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ in all recursive steps can be computed in $O(n \log^3 n)$ time and get the next result.

Theorem 2 *There is an algorithm which given a planar graph G of n vertices and an integer k, in $O(n \log^3 n)$ time either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$ or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant.*

Kammer and Tholey give an algorithm which for an input G and integer k, in $O(nk^3)$ time constructs a tree-decomposition of width at most $(9+\delta)k$ or outputs $\mathrm{tw}(G) > k$ [24, 25]. The algorithm uses *crest separators* to decompose G into pieces (subgraphs), each piece contains one component (called *crest* with a normal distance k from a selected set of edges called *coast*) and for each crest computes a vertex-cut set of size at most $3k$ to separate the crest from the coast. If such a vertex-cut set can not be found for some crest then the algorithm concludes $\mathrm{tw}(G) > k$. Otherwise, the algorithm computes a tree-decomposition for the graph H obtained by removing all crests from G and works on each crest recursively. Finally, the algorithm constructs a tree-decomposition of G from the tree-decomposition of H and those of crests. By applying the crest separators to decompose G into pieces, each piece having one component $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, and applying the minimum face separating cycle to find a vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ in each piece, we show that either a vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ with $|\partial(A_Z)| \leq k$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ in all recursive steps or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor can be computed in $O(nk^2)$ time and get the result below.

Theorem 3 *There is an algorithm which given a planar graph G of n vertices and an integer k, in $O(nk^2)$ time either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$ or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant.*

Theorem 1 follows from Theorems 2 and 3.

The next section gives the preliminaries of the paper. We prove Theorems 2 and 3 in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. The final section concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

It is convenient to view a vertex-cut set $\partial(A_Z)$ in a graph as an edge in a hypergraph in some cases. A hypergraph G consists of a set $V(G)$ of vertices and a set $E(G)$ of edges, each edge is a subset of $V(G)$ with at least two elements. A hypergraph G is a graph if for every $e \in E(G)$, e has two elements. For a subset $A \subseteq E(G)$, we denote $\cup_{e \in A} e$ by $V(A)$ and

denote $E(G) \setminus A$ by $\overline{A}$. For $A \subseteq E(G)$, the pair $(A, \overline{A})$ is a *separation* of G and we denote by $\partial(A)$ the vertex set $V(A) \cap V(\overline{A})$. The *order* of separation $(A, \overline{A})$ is $|\partial(A)|$. A hypergraph H is a subgraph of G if $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$ and $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$. For $A \subseteq E(G)$ and $W \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[A]$ and $G[W]$ the subgraphs of G induced by A and W, respectively. For a subgraph H of G, we denote $G[E(G) \setminus E(H)]$ by $G \setminus H$.

The notions of branchwidth and branch-decomposition are introduced by Robertson and Seymour [28]. A *branch-decomposition* of hypergraph G is a pair (ϕ, T) where T is a ternary tree and ϕ is a bijection from the set of leaves of T to $E(G)$. We refer the edges of T as links and the vertices of T as nodes. Consider a link e of T and let L_1 and L_2 denote the sets of leaves of T in the two respective subtrees of T obtained by removing e. We say that the separation $(\phi(L_1), \phi(L_2))$ is induced by this link e of T. We define the width of the branch-decomposition (ϕ, T) to be the largest order of the separations induced by links of T. The *branchwidth* of G, denoted by $\mathrm{bw}(G)$, is the minimum width of all branch-decompositions of G. In the rest of this paper, we identify a branch-decomposition (ϕ, T) with the tree T, leaving the bijection implicit and regarding each leaf of T as an edge of G.

A walk in graph G is a sequence of edges $e_1, e_2, ..., e_k$, where $e_i = \{v_{i-1}, v_i\}$. We call v_0 and v_k the end vertices and other vertices the internal vertices of the walk. A walk is a path if all vertices in the walk are distinct. A walk is a cycle if it has at least three vertices, $v_0 = v_k$ and $v_1, ..., v_k$ are distinct.

Let Σ be a sphere. For an open segment s homeomorphic to $\{x | 0 < x < 1\}$ in Σ, we denote by $\mathrm{cl}(s)$ the closure of s. A planar embedding of a graph G is a mapping $\rho : V(G) \cup E(G) \to \Sigma \cup 2^{\Sigma}$ such that

- for $u \in V(G)$, $\rho(u)$ is a point of Σ, and for distinct $u, v \in V(G)$, $\rho(u) \neq \rho(v)$;
- for each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$, $\rho(e)$ is an open segment in Σ with $\rho(u)$ and $\rho(v)$ the two end points in $\mathrm{cl}(\rho(e)) \setminus \rho(e)$; and
- for distinct $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$, $\mathrm{cl}(\rho(e_1)) \cap \mathrm{cl}(\rho(e_2)) = \{\rho(u) | u \in e_1 \cap e_2\}$.

A graph G is planar if it has a planar embedding ρ, and (G, ρ) is called a plane graph. We may simply use G to denote the plane graph (G, ρ), leaving the embedding ρ implicit. For a plane graph G, each connected component of $\Sigma \setminus (\cup_{e \in E(G)} \mathrm{cl}(\rho(e)))$ is a face of G. We denote by $V(f)$ and $E(f)$ the set of vertices and the set of edges incident to face f, respectively. We say that face f is bounded by the edges of $E(f)$.

A plane graph G is *biconnected* if for any distinct vertices $u, v, w \in V(G)$, there is a path of G between u and v that does not contain w. It suffices to prove Theorems 2 and 3 for a biconnected G because if G is not biconnected, the problems of finding branch-decompositions and cylinder minors of G can be solved individually for each biconnected component.

For a plane graph G, a curve μ on Σ is *normal* if μ does not intersect any edge of G. The length of a normal curve μ is the number of connected components of $\mu \setminus \bigcup_{v \in V(G)} \{\rho(v)\}$. For vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, the *normal distance* $\mathrm{nd}_G(u, v)$ is defined as the shortest length of

a normal curve between $\rho(u)$ and $\rho(v)$. The *normal distance* between two vertex-subsets $U, W \subseteq V(G)$ is defined as $\mathrm{nd}_G(U,W) = \min_{u\in U, v\in W} \mathrm{nd}_G(u,v)$. We also use $\mathrm{nd}_G(U,v)$ for $\mathrm{nd}_G(U,\{v\})$ and $\mathrm{nd}_G(u,W)$ for $\mathrm{nd}_G(\{u\},W)$.

A *noose* of G is a closed normal curve on Σ that does not intersect with itself. A noose ν of G separates Σ into two open regions R_1 and R_2 and induces a separation $(A, \overline{A})$ of G with $A = \{e \in E(G) \mid \rho(e) \subseteq R_1\}$ and $\overline{A} = \{e \in E(G) \mid \rho(e) \subseteq R_2\}$. We also say ν induces edge subset A ($\overline{A}$). A separation (resp. an edge subset) of G is called *noose-induced* if there is a noose which induces the separation (resp. edge subset). A noose ν separates two edge subsets A_1 and A_2 if ν induces a separation $(A, \overline{A})$ with $A_1 \subseteq A$ and $A_2 \subseteq \overline{A}$. We also say that the noose induced subset A separates A_1 and A_2.

For plane graph G and a noose ν induced $A \subseteq E(G)$, we denote by $G|A$ the plane hypergraph obtained by replacing all edges of A with edge $\partial(A)$ (i.e., $V(G|A) = (V(G) \setminus V(A)) \cup \partial(A)$ and $E(G|A) = (E(G) \setminus A) \cup \{\partial(A)\}$). An embedding of $G|A$ can be obtained from G with $\rho(\partial(A))$ an open disk (homeomorphic to $\{(x,y)|x^2+y^2<1\}$) which is the open region separated by ν and contains A. For a collection $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, .., A_r\}$ of mutually disjoint edge-subsets of G, $(..(G|A_1)|..)|A_r$ is denoted by $G|\mathcal{A}$.

3 $O(n \log^3 n)$ time algorithm

We give an algorithm to prove Theorem 2. Our algorithm follows the approach of the work in [19]. Let G be a plane graph of n vertices, e_0 be an edge of G and $k, h > 0$ be integers. We first try to separate e_0 and the subgraph of G induced by the vertices with the normal distance at least h from e_0. Since the subgraph may not be biconnected, let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the set of biconnected components of G such that for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\mathrm{nd}_G(e_0, V(Z)) = h$. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, our algorithm computes a minimum noose induced subset A_Z separating Z and e_0. If for some $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $|\partial(A_Z)| > k$ then the algorithm constructs a $(k+1) \times h$ cylinder minor of G in $O(n)$ time by Lemma 1 proved in [19]. Otherwise, a set $\mathcal{A}$ of noose induced subsets with the following properties is computed: (1) for every $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}$, $|\partial(A_Z)| \leq k$, (2) for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, there is an $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}$ which separates Z and e_0 and (3) for distinct $A_Z, A_{Z'} \in \mathcal{A}$, $A_Z \cap A'_Z = \emptyset$. Such an $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *good-separator* for $\mathcal{Z}$ and e_0.

Lemma 1 *[19] Given a plane graph G and integers $k, h > 0$, let A_1 and A_2 be edge subsets of G satisfying the following conditions: (1) each of separations $(A_1, \overline{A_1})$ and $(A_2, \overline{A_2})$ is noose-induced; (2) $G[A_2]$ is biconnected; (3) $\mathrm{nd}_G(V(\overline{A_1}), V(A_2)) \geq h$; and (4) every noose of G that separates $\overline{A_1}$ and A_2 has length $> k$. Then G has a $(k+1) \times h$ cylinder minor and given $(G|\overline{A_1})|A_2$, such a minor can be constructed in $O(|V(A_1 \cap \overline{A_2})|)$ time.*

Given a good-separator $\mathcal{A}$ for $\mathcal{Z}$ and e_0, our algorithm constructs a branch-decomposition of plane hypergraph $G|\mathcal{A}$ with width at most $k+2h$ by Lemma 2 shown in [20, 33]. For each $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}$, the algorithm computes a cylinder minor or a branch-decomposition for the plane hypergraph $G|\overline{A}_Z$ recursively. If a branch-decomposition of $G|\overline{A}_Z$ is found for every $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}$, the algorithm constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $k+2h$ from the

branch-decomposition of $G|\mathcal{A}$ and those of $G|\overline{A}_Z$ by Lemma 3 which is straightforward from the definitions of branch-decompositions.

Lemma 2 *[20, 33] Let $k > 0$ and $h > 0$ be integers. Let G be a plane hypergraph with each edge of G incident to at most k vertices. If there is an edge e_0 such that for any vertex v of G, $\mathrm{nd}_G(e_0, v) \leq h$ then given e_0, a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $k+2h$ can be constructed in $O(|V(G)| + |E(G)|)$ time.*

The upper bound $k + 2h$ is shown in Theorem 3.1 in [20]. The normal distance in [20] between a pair of vertices is twice of the normal distance in this paper between the same pair of vertices. Tamaki gives a linear time algorithm to construct a branch-decomposition of width at most $k + 2h$ [33].

Lemma 3 *Given a plane hypergraph G and a noose-induced separation $(A, \overline{A})$ of G, let T_A and $T_{\overline{A}}$ be branch-decompositions of $G|\overline{A}$ and $G|A$ respectively. Let $T_A + T_{\overline{A}}$ to be the tree obtained from T_A and $T_{\overline{A}}$ by joining the link incident to the leaf $\partial(A)$ in T_A and the link incident to the leaf $\partial(A)$ in $T_{\overline{A}}$ into one link and removing the leaves $\partial(A)$. Then $T_A + T_{\overline{A}}$ is a branch-decomposition of G with width $\max\{|\partial(A)|, k_A, k_{\overline{A}}\}$ where k_A is the width of T_A and $k_{\overline{A}}$ is the width of $T_{\overline{A}}$.*

To make a concrete progress in each recursive step, the following technique in [19] is used to compute $\mathcal{A}$. For a plane hypergraph G, a vertex subset e_0 of G and an integer $d \geq 0$, let

$$\mathrm{reach}_G(e_0, d) = \bigcup \{v \in V(G) | \mathrm{nd}_G(e_0, v) \leq d\}$$

denote the set of vertices of G with the normal distance at most d from set e_0. Let $\alpha > 0$ be an arbitrary constant. For integer $k \geq 2$, let $d_1 = \lceil \frac{\alpha k}{2} \rceil$ and $d_2 = d_1 + \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$. The *layer tree* $\mathrm{LT}(G, e_0)$ is defined as follows:

1. the root of the tree is G;
2. each biconnected component X of $G[V(G) \setminus \mathrm{reach}_G(e_0, d_1 - 1)]$ is a node in level 1 of the tree and is a child of the root; and
3. each biconnected component Z of $G[V(G) \setminus \mathrm{reach}_G(e_0, d_2 - 1)]$ is a node in level 2 of the tree and is a child of the biconnected component X in level 1 that contains Z.

For $h = d_2$, $\mathcal{Z}$ is the set of leaf nodes of $\mathrm{LT}(G, e_0)$ in level 2. For a node X of $\mathrm{LT}(G, e_0)$ in level 1, let $\mathcal{Z}_X$ be the set of child nodes of X. It is shown in [19] that for any $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, if a minimum noose in the plane hypergraph $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ separating Z and $\overline{X}$ has length $> k$ then G has a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor. From this, a good-separator $\mathcal{A}_X$ for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$ can be computed in hypergraph $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$, and the union of $\mathcal{A}_X$ for every X gives a good-separator $\mathcal{A}$ for $\mathcal{Z}$ and e_0.

To compute $\mathcal{A}_X$, we convert $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ to a weighted plane graph and compute a minimum noose induced subset A_Z separating $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$ by finding a minimum face separating cycle in the weighted plane graph. We use the algorithm by Borradaile et al. [11] to compute the face separating cycles.

For an open disk D in Σ, let $\mathrm{cl}(D)$ be the closure of D and $\mathrm{bd}(D) = \mathrm{cl}(D) \setminus D$ be the boundary of D. For edge $\partial(\overline{X})$ in $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$, the embedding $\rho(\partial(\overline{X}))$ is an open disk and $E_{\overline{X}} = \{\mathrm{bd}(\rho(\partial(\overline{X}))) \setminus \{\rho(u)|u \in \partial(\overline{X})\}\}$ is a set of open segments. Similarly, for each edge $\partial(Z)$ in $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$, $E_Z = \{\mathrm{bd}(\rho(\partial(Z))) \setminus \{\rho(u)|u \in \partial(Z)\}\}$ is a set of open segments. We convert hypergraph $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ to a plane graph G_X as follows: edge $\partial(\overline{X})$ is replaced by the set of edges which are segments in $E_{\overline{X}}$ and for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, edge $\partial(Z)$ is replaced by the set of edges which are segments in E_Z.

We denote the face in G_X bounded by edges of $E_{\overline{X}}$ by $f_{\overline{X}}$. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, we denote the face in G_X bounded by edges of E_Z by f_Z. A face in G_X which is not $f_{\overline{X}}$ or any of f_Z is called a *natural face* in G_X. We convert G_X to a weighted plane graph H_X as follows: For each natural face f in G_X with $|V(f)| > 3$, we add a new vertex u_f and new edges $\{u_f, v\}$ in f for every vertex v in $V(f)$. Each new edge $\{u_f, v\}$ is assigned the weight $1/2$. Each edge of G_X is assigned the weight 1. The length of a cycle (resp. path) in H_X is the sum of the weights assigned to the edges in the cycle (resp. path). For $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle is a cycle separating f_Z and $f_{\overline{X}}$ with the minimum length. A noose in G_X is called a *natural noose* if it intersects only natural faces in G_X. It is shown in [19] that for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, a minimum natural noose in G_X separating E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$ in G_X is a minimum noose separating Z and $\overline{X}$ in $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$. By Lemma 4 below, such a natural noose ν can be computed by finding a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C in H_X. The subset A_Z induced by ν in $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ is also called *cycle C induced subset*.

Lemma 4 *Let H_X be the weighted plane graph obtained from G_X. For any $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C in H_X, there is a natural noose ν which separates E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$ in G_X with the same length as that of C. For any minimum natural noose ν in G_X separating E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$, there is a $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C in H_X with the same length as that of ν.*

Proof: Let C be a $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle in H_X. For each edge $\{u, v\}$ in C with $u, v \in V(G_X)$, $\{u, v\}$ is incident to a natural face f because f_Z is not incident to $f_{\overline{X}}$ by $\mathrm{nd}_{G_X}(V(\overline{X}), V(Z)) = \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$. We draw a simple curve with u, v as its end points in face f. For each pair of edges $\{u, u_f\}$ and $\{u_f, v\}$ in C with $u, v \in V(G_X)$ and $u_f \in V(H_X) \setminus V(G_X)$, we draw a simple curve with u, v as its end points in the face f of G_X where the new added vertex u_f is placed. Then the union of the curves form a natural noose ν which separates E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$ in G_X. Each of edge $\{u, v\}$ with $u, v \in V(G_X)$ is assigned weight 1. For a new added vertex u_f, each of edges $\{u, u_f\}, \{u_f, v\}$ is assigned weight $1/2$. Therefore, the lengths of ν and C are the same.

Let ν be a minimum natural noose separating E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$ in G_X. Then ν contains at most two vertices of G_X incident to a same natural face of G_X, otherwise a shorter natural noose separating E_Z and $E_{\overline{X}}$ can be formed. The vertices on ν partitions ν into a set of simple curves such that at most one curve is drawn in each natural face of G_X. For a curve

with the end points u and v in a natural face f, if $\{u, v\}$ is an edge of G_X then we take $\{u, v\}$ in H_X as a candidate, otherwise we take edges $\{u, u_f\}, \{u_f, v\}$ in H_X as candidates, where u_f is the vertex added in f in getting H_X. These candidates form a $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C in H_X. Because each edge of G_X is given weight 1 and each added edge is given weight $1/2$ in H_X, the lengths of C and ν are the same. □

We assume that for every pair of vertices u, v in H_X, there is a unique shortest path between u and v. This can be realized by perturbating the edge weight $w(e)$ of each edge e in H_X as follows. Assume that the edges in H_X are $e_1, ...e_m$. For each edge e_i, let $w'(e_i) = w(e_i) + \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}$. Then it is easy to check that for any pair of vertices u and v in H_X, there is a unique shortest path between u and v w.r.t. to w'; and the shortest path between u and v w.r.t. w' is a shortest path between u and v w.r.t. w.

For a plane graph G, a *minimum cycle base tree* (MCB tree) introduced in [12] is an edge-weighted tree $\tilde{T}$ such that

- there is a bijection from the faces of G to the nodes of $\tilde{T}$;
- removing each edge e from $\tilde{T}$ partitions $\tilde{T}$ into two subtrees $\tilde{T}_1$ and $\tilde{T}_2$; this edge e corresponds to a cycle which separates every pair of faces f and g with f in $\tilde{T}_1$ and g in $\tilde{T}_2$; and
- for any distinct faces f and g, the minimum-weight edge on the unique path between f and g in $\tilde{T}$ has weight equal to the length of a minimum (f, g)-separating cycle.

The next lemma gives the running time for computing a MCB tree of a plane graph and that for obtaining a cycle from the MCB tree.

Lemma 5 *[11] Given a plane graph G of n vertices with positive edge weights, a MCB tree of G can be computed in $O(n \log^3 n)$ time. Further, for any distinct faces f and g in G, given a minimum weight edge in the path between f and g in the MCB tree, a minimum (f, g)-separating cycle C can be obtained in $O(|C|)$ time, $|C|$ is the number of edges in C.*

Using Lemma 5 for computing a MCB tree $\tilde{T}$ of H_X and thus $\mathcal{A}_X$, our algorithm is summarized in Procedure Branch-Minor below. In the procedure, U is a noose induced edge subset and initially $U = \{e_0\}$.

Procedure Branch-Minor($G|U$)
Input: A biconnected plane hypergraph $G|U$ with $\partial(U)$ specified, $|\partial(U)| \leq k$ and every other edge has two vertices.
Output: Either a branch-decomposition of $G|U$ of width at most $k + 2h$, $h = d_2$, or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G.

1. If $\mathrm{nd}_{G|U}(\partial(U), v) \leq h$ for every $v \in V(G|U)$ then apply Lemma 2 to find a branch-decomposition of $G|U$. Otherwise, proceed to the next step.

2. Compute the layer tree $\mathrm{LT}(G|U, \partial(U))$.

   For every node X of $\mathrm{LT}(G|U, \partial(U))$ in level 1, compute $\mathcal{A}_X$ as follows:

   (a) Compute H_X from $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$.

   (b) Compute a MCB tree $\tilde{T}$ of H_X by Lemma 5.

   (c) Find a face f_Z, $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, in $\tilde{T}$ by a breadth first search from $f_{\overline{X}}$ such that the path between f_Z and $f_{\overline{X}}$ in $\tilde{T}$ does not contain $f_{Z'}$ for any $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $Z' \neq Z$. Find the minimum weight edge $e_Z = \{u, v\}$ in the path between f_Z and $f_{\overline{X}}$, and the cycle C from edge e_Z.

   If C has length $> k$ then compute a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor by Lemma 1 and terminate.

   Otherwise, compute the cycle C induced subset A_Z and include A_Z to $\mathcal{A}_X$. For each node f of $\tilde{T}$, if edge e_Z is in the path between f and $f_{\overline{X}}$ in $\tilde{T}$ then delete f from $\tilde{T}$.

   Repeat the above until $\tilde{T}$ does not contain any f_Z for $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$.

   Let $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{X:\text{level 1 node}} \mathcal{A}_X$ and proceed to the next step.

3. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, call Branch-Minor$(G|\overline{A})$ to construct a branch-decomposition T_A or a cylinder minor of $G|\overline{A}$.

   If a branch-decomposition T_A is found for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, Lemma 2 is applied to $(G|U)|\mathcal{A}$ to construct a branch-decomposition T_0 of $(G|U)|\mathcal{A}$ and Lemma 3 is used to combine these branch-decompositions T_A, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and T_0 into a branch-decomposition T of $G|U$ and return T.

Now we prove Theorem 2 which is re-stated below.

Theorem 4 *There is an algorithm which given a planar graph G of n vertices and an integer k, in $O(n \log^3 n)$ time either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$, $\delta > 0$ is a constant, or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G.*

Proof: The input hypergraph $G|\overline{A}$ of our algorithm in each recursive step for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is biconnected. For the $\mathcal{A}_X$ computed in Step 2, obviously (1) for every $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}_X$, $|\partial(A_Z)| \leq k$; (2) due to the way we find the cycles from the MCB tree, for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, there is exactly one noose-induced subset $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}_X$ separating Z and $\overline{X}$; and (3) from the unique shortest path in H_X, for distinct $A_Z, A_{Z'} \in \mathcal{A}_X$, $A_Z \cap A_{Z'} = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\mathcal{A}_X$ is a good-separator for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$. From this, $\mathcal{A}$ is a good separator for $\mathcal{Z}$ and U and our algorithm computes a branch-decomposition or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G. The width of the branch-decomposition computed is at most

$$k + 2h = k + 2(d_1 + \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil) \leq k + 2(\lceil \frac{\alpha k}{2} \rceil) + (k+2) \leq (2+\delta)k,$$

where δ is the smallest constant with $\delta k \geq \alpha k + 4$.

Let M, m_x, m be the numbers of edges in $G[\text{reach}_{G|U}(\partial(U), d_2)]$, $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X, H_X$, respectively. Then $m = O(m_x)$. In Step 2, the layer tree $\text{LT}(G|U, \partial(U))$ can be computed in $O(M)$ time. For each level 1 node X, it takes $O(m)$ time to compute H_X and by Lemma 5, it takes $O(m \log^3 m)$ time to compute a MCB tree $\tilde{T}$ of H_X. In Step 2(c), it takes $O(m)$ time to compute a cylinder minor by Lemma 1. From Property (3) of a good-separator, each edge of H_X appears in at most two cycles which induce the subsets in $\mathcal{A}_X$. So Step 2(c) takes $O(m)$ time to compute $\mathcal{A}_X$. Therefore, the total time for Steps 2(a)-(c) is $O(m \log^3 m)$. For distinct level 1 nodes X and X', the edge sets of subgraphs $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $(G|\overline{X'})|\mathcal{Z}_{X'}$ are disjoint. From this, $\sum_{X:\text{level 1 node}} m_x = O(M)$. Therefore, the total time for Step is

$$\sum_{X:\text{level 1 node}} O(m_x \log^3 m_x) = O(M \log^3 M).$$

The time for other steps in Procedure Branch-Minor$(G|U)$ is $O(M)$. The number of recursive calls in which each vertex of $G|U$ is involved in the computation of Step 2 is $O(\frac{1}{\alpha}) = O(1)$. Therefore, the running time of the algorithm is $O(n \log^3 n)$. □

4 $O(nk^2)$ time algorithm

To get an algorithm for Theorem 3, we follow the framework of Procedure Branch-Minor in the previous section but use a different approach from that in Steps 2(b)(c) to compute face separating cycles and a good separator for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$. Given $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and H_X, for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ the edges incident to face f_Z in H_X form a $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle, denoted by C_Z and called the *boundary cycle* of Z. Notice that the number of edges in C_Z, denoted by $|C_Z|$, equals to $|\partial(Z)|$. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| \leq k$, we take C_Z as a "minimum" $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle and the cycle C_Z induced subset Z as a candidate for a noose induced edge subset A_Z which separates Z and $\overline{X}$. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| > k$, we apply the techniques in [24, 25] to decompose H_X into pieces (subgraphs), each piece contains one Z with $|C_Z| > k$, and use the technique for minimum face separating cycles in [12] to find a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle in each piece.

We briefly review some notions and techniques introduced in [24, 25]. For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| > k$, we add a new vertex (called *crest* and denoted also by Z) in face f_Z and add new edges $\{Z, v\}$ for $v \in V(f_Z)$. We denote also by H_X the graph obtained by adding the new vertices and edges in f_Z. For each added edge, we assign a weight $1/2$. For each vertex u in G_X, let $h(u) = \text{nd}_{G_X}(V(f_{\overline{X}}), u)$. For each face f in G_X, let $h(f) = \min_{u \in V(f)} h(u)$. For each vertex u in H_X we define a label $l(u)$: if u is a vertex in G_X then $l(u) = h(u)$, otherwise u is an added vertex to a face f and $l(u) = h(f) + 1/2$.

For each vertex u, we enumerate the vertices in $N(u) = \{v | \{u, v\} \in E(H_X)\}$ as $u_0, ..., u_j$ based on a cyclic order that the vertices are adjacent to u in H_X. For $0 \leq a < b \bmod (j+1)$, set $N_{ab} = \{u_i | a \leq i < b \bmod (j+1)\}$ is called a low-neighborhood subset of u if $l(u_i) < l(u)$ for $u_i \in N_{ab}$ and $l(u_i) \geq l(u)$ for u_i with $i = (a-1) \bmod (j+1)$ and $i = b \bmod (j+1)$.

For each u with $l(u) > 0$, there is a non-empty low-neighborhood subset of u. For each low-neighborhood subset of u, one vertex in the subset is chosen as a *neighborhood representative* of u. For each u with $l(u) > 0$, one neighborhood representative of u is chosen as the *down vertex* of u and the edge between u and its down vertex is called the *down edge* of u. The *down path* from a vertex u to a vertex $w \in V(f_X)$ is the path between u and w consisting of down edges only.

For a path L in H_X, the depth of L is defined as $d(L) = \min_{u \in V(L)} l(u)$. A path R between crests Z and Z' is called a *ridge* between Z and Z' if $d(R)$ has the maximum depth among all paths between Z and Z' and R has the minimum number of vertices u with $l(u) = d(R)$. A *crest separator* on a ridge R between crests Z and Z' in H_X is a tuple $S = (L_1, L_2)$, where L_1 is the down path from a vertex u on R with $l(u) = d(R)$ to a vertex in $V(f_{\overline{X}})$ and L_2 is a path composed of the edge $\{u, u'\}$ and the down path from u' to a vertex in $V(f_{\overline{X}})$, where u' is a neighbor of u and $l(u') = l(u)$, or u' is a neighborhood representative of u and u' is not in L_1. A crest separator $S = (L_1, L_2)$ is called *disjoint* if path L_1 and the down path from u' do not have a common vertex, otherwise *converged*. For a converged crest separator S, the paths L_1 and L_2 in S have a common sub-path from a vertex other than u to a vertex w in $V(f_{\overline{X}})$. The vertex $v \neq u$ in the common sub-path with the largest $l(v)$ is called the *low-point* and the sub-path from v to w is called the *converged-path*, denoted by $\text{cp}(S)$, of S.

For a ridge R between crests Z and Z', there is a crest separator S on R that decomposes H_X into two pieces P and Q such that Z is in P, Z' is in Q and $E(S) = E(P) \cap E(Q)$. It is known (Lemma 7 in [25]) that given a set $\mathcal{W}_X$ of r crests in H_X, there is a set $\mathcal{S}_X$ of $r-1$ crest separators with the following properties:

- The crest separators of $\mathcal{S}_X$ decompose H_X into pieces $P_1, ..., P_r$ such that each piece has exactly one crest $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$.
- For each $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$, there is exactly one pair of pieces P_i and P_j such that S is a crest separator on a ridge between the crest in P_i and the crest in P_j, and $E(S) = E(P_i) \cap E(P_j)$.
- Let $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the graph that $V(T_{\mathcal{S}}) = \{P_1, ..., P_r\}$ and there is an edge $\{P_i, P_j\} \in E(T_{\mathcal{S}})$ if there is a crest separator S in $\mathcal{S}_X$ with $E(S) = E(P_i) \cap E(P_j)$. Then $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a tree.

The tuple $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$ is called a *good mountain structure tree* (GMST). We call $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ the *underlying tree* of the GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$. We call each vertex of $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ a *basic piece* of the GMST. For each edge $\{P_i, P_j\}$ in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$, we call the $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$ with $E(S) = E(P_i) \cap E(P_j)$ *the crest separator on edge* $\{P_i, P_j\}$. The following result is proved in [24, 25].

Lemma 6 *[24, 25] Given H_X, $\mathcal{W}_X$ and k, a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$ can be computed in $O(|V(H_X)|k)$ time.*

Given a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, we choose a leaf vertex P_i in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ as the root. Each crest separator $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$ decomposes H_X into two pieces, one contains P_i, called the *upper piece* by S, and the other does not, called the *lower piece* by S. We say a piece P is *enclosed*



Figure 1: Graph Q' obtained from cutting Q along $\mathrm{cp}(S)$.

by a converged crest separator S if $P \setminus \mathrm{cp}(S)$ does not have any edge incident to $f_{\overline{X}}$. For vertices u and v in a piece P, we denote the length of a shortest path in P between u and v by $\mathrm{dist}_P(u, v)$. For vertices u and v in a disjoint crest separator S, let $l_S(u, v)$ be the length of the path in S between u and v. For vertices u and v in a converged crest separator S, let $l_S(u, v)$ be the length of the path in S between u and v if one of u and v is in $\mathrm{cp}(S)$, otherwise let $l_S(u, v)$ be the length of the path in S between u and v that does not have the the low-point of S.

For a disjoint crest separator S, we define $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ (resp. $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$) to be the weighted graph on the vertices in S such that for every pair of vertices u and v in S, if $\mathrm{dist}_P(u, v) < l_S(u, v)$, P is the upper piece (resp. lower piece) by S, then there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ whose weight is $\mathrm{dist}_P(u, v)$.

A converged crest separator S decomposes H_X into two pieces and exactly one piece P is enclosed by S. Let Q be the other piece not enclosed by S. We create a plane graph Q' from Q by cutting Q along $\mathrm{cp}(S)$: for each vertex v in $\mathrm{cp}(S)$ we create a duplicate v' and for each edge e in $\mathrm{cp}(S)$ we create a duplicate e' (see Figure 1). Let S' be subgraph induced by the edges of S and the duplicated edges. For every pair of vertices u, v in S', let $l_{S'}(u, v)$ be the length of the path in S' between u and v. For Q the upper piece by S, we define $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ to be the weighted graph on the vertices in S' such that for vertices u and v, if $\mathrm{dist}_{Q'}(u, v) < l_{S'}(u, v)$ then there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ in $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ whose weight is $\mathrm{dist}_{Q'}(u, v)$; and we define $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ to be the weighted graph on the vertices in $S \setminus \mathrm{cp}(S)$ such that for vertices u and v, if $\mathrm{dist}_P(u, v) < l_S(u, v)$ then there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ in $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ whose weight is $\mathrm{dist}_P(u, v)$. For Q the lower piece by S, we define $low\mathrm{DDG}(G)$ the weighted graph on the vertices in S' and $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ the weighted on the vertices in $S \setminus \mathrm{cp}(S)$ as explained above.

The following properties of the down paths, GMST, $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ can be easily verified:

(I) For any pair of vertices u and v in a down path, the path between u and v in the down path is a shortest path because the length of a shortest path between any pair of vertices u and v in H_X is at least $|l(u) - l(v)|$. From this, there is no edge between u and v in $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ ($low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$) if u and v are in a same down path of S.

(II) There are $O(k)$ vertices in S and every edge in $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ ($low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$) has weight strictly smaller than $2k$ because $l_S(u, v) \leq 2k$ and each edge in S has weight $1/2$ or 1.

(III) In a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, let $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$ be the crest separator on edge $\{P_i, P_j\}$ in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ and let R be the ridge between the crest Z in P_i and the crest Z' in P_j. We assume that Z and Z' are in the upper piece and lower piece by S, respectively. Then for each edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ (resp. $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$), the shortest path between u and v in the upper piece (resp. lower piece) does not intersect any ridge R' with $d(R') \geq d(R)$, because otherwise the shortest path between u and v has length at least $l_S(u, v)$, a contradiction to that it has length smaller than $l_S(u, v)$.

(IV) Let S, R, Z, Z' and edge $e = \{u, v\}$ be those in Property (III). From Property (III), the shortest path between u and v in the upper piece (resp. lower piece) and the segment of S between u and v that intersects R form a cycle which separates f_Z (resp. $f_{Z'}$) from $f_{\overline{X}}$.

From Properties (I)-(III), the $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ can be computed as shown in the next lemma (Lemma 18 in [25]).

Lemma 7 *[25] Given a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$ can be computed in $O(|V(H_X)|k + |\mathcal{S}_X|k^3)$ time.*

The computation of $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ in Lemma 7 (implicitly) uses a linear time algorithm by Thorup [34] for the single shortest path problem in graphs with integer edge weight as a subroutine. This requires that the edge weight in H_X, $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ can be expressed in $O(1)$ words in integer form. So the perturbation technique used in the previous section cannot be used in the computation above. In the algorithm for Theorem 3, we do not assume the uniqueness of shortest paths when we compute minimum separating cycles. A minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C cuts Σ into two regions, one contains f_Z and the other contains $f_{\overline{X}}$. Let $\mathrm{ins}(C)$ be the region containing f_Z. We say two cycles C and C' *intersect* with each other if $\mathrm{ins}(C) \cap \mathrm{ins}(C') \neq \emptyset$, $\mathrm{ins}(C) \setminus \mathrm{ins}(C') \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{ins}(C') \setminus \mathrm{ins}(C) \neq \emptyset$. In the previous section, we do not have intersected minimum separating cycles because of the uniqueness of shortest paths. However, two minimum separating cycles computed without the assumption of unique shortest paths may intersect with each other. We eliminate each intersected cycle pair using the properties of GMST and $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)/low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$, and then compute a good separator for $\mathcal{A}_X$.

Given a set $\mathcal{W}_X$ of crests in H_X, our algorithm for Theorem 3 computes a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, calculates $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ for every crest separator $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$, and finds a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle for every crest $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$ using the GMST, $up\mathrm{DDG}(S)$ and $low\mathrm{DDG}(S)$. More specifically, we replace Steps 2(b)(c) in Procedure Branch-Minor with the following subroutine to get an algorithm for Theorem 3.

Subroutine Crest-Separator
Input: Graph H_X and integer k.
Output: Good separator $\mathcal{A}_X$ for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$ or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor.

(1) For every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| \leq k$, take C_Z as a $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle.

(2) For every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| > k$, add crest (vertex) Z and edges $\{Z, v\}$ for $v \in V(f_Z)$ to f_Z in H_X. For each added edge, assign a weight 1/2. $\mathcal{W}_X = \{Z | Z \text{ is a crest.}\}$.

(3) Compute a GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$ by Lemma 6.

Calculate $up\text{DDG}(S)$ and $low\text{DDG}(S)$ for every crest separator $S \in \mathcal{S}_X$ by Lemma 7.

(4) Mark every crest un-separated and repeat the following until all crests are marked separated.

If there exists an un-separated crest Z, compute a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle C using the GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, $up\text{DDG}(S)$ and $low\text{DDG}(S)$. We call C the *cycle computed for crest* Z.

If the length of C is greater than k then compute a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor by Lemma 1 and terminate. Otherwise, take this cycle as the minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle for every $Z \in \text{ins}(C)$ and mark every crest in $\text{ins}(C)$ separated.

(5) Compute $\mathcal{A}_X$ from the (minimum) face separating cycles obtained in Steps (1) and (4).

We first show the time complexity of our algorithm for computing (minimum) face separating cycles for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$.

Lemma 8 *The (minimum) face separating cycles for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ can be computed in $O(|E(H_X)|k^2)$ time.*

Proof: Let m be the numbers of edges in H_X. Notice that each edge of H_X appears in at most two boundary cycles C_Z. For all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| \leq k$, $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycles can be found in $O(m)$ time. For each crest $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$, C_Z has more than k edges in H_X. Therefore, $|\mathcal{W}_X| = O(m/k)$. A GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, $up\text{DDG}(S)$ and $low\text{DDG}(S)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ can be computed in $O(mk + |\mathcal{W}_X|k^3) = O(mk^2)$ time (Lemmas 6 and 7).

For an un-separated crest $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$, let P be the basic piece in the GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$ containing Z. Then there is a shortest path $Z \leftrightarrow w$ in P between Z and a vertex w in $V(f_{\overline{X}})$. We add a vertex x in the face $f_{\overline{X}}$ and let L be the path formed by edge $\{w, x\}$ and the edges in $Z \leftrightarrow w$. Path L can be found in $O(k)$ time. Let $P(L)$ be the plane graph obtained from P by cutting along L: for each internal vertex u in L create a duplicate u', for each edge e in L create a duplicate e' and create a new face bounded by edges of L and their duplicates (see Figure 2). Let $H_X(L)$ be the graph obtained from H_X by replacing P with $P(L)$. Let $\partial(P(L))$ be the vertex cut-set which partitions $E(H_X(L))$ into $E(P(L))$ and $E(H_X(L)) \setminus E(P(L))$.

The *external dense distance graph* of $P(L)$, denoted by $ext\text{DDG}(P(L))$, is the weighted graph on $\partial(P(L))$ that for vertices u and v, if $\text{dist}_{H_X(L) \setminus P(L)}(u, v) < \text{dist}_{P(L)}(u, v)$ then there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ in $ext\text{DDG}(P(L))$ whose weight is $\text{dist}_{H_X(L) \setminus P(L)}(u, v)$. For a vertex u in path L, let C_u be a shortest path in the graph consisting of $P(L)$ and $ext\text{DDG}(P(L))$ between u and its duplicate u'. Let y be a vertex in L such that C_y has the minimum length



Figure 2: Graph $P(L)$ obtained from basic piece P by cutting along path L.

among the paths C_u for all vertices u in L. Then C_y gives a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle in H_X [27]. It is known (Section 2.2 in [12]) that such a C_y can be computed in $O((|E(P)| + |E(ext\text{DDG}(P(L)))|) \log^2 k)$ time.

For each basic piece P in GMST $(H_X, \mathcal{S}_X, \mathcal{W}_X)$, let $\tilde{S}$ be the crest separator on the edge between P and its parent node and let $\mathcal{S}_P$ be the set of crest separators on an edge between P and a child node of P in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then we can replace $ext\text{DDG}(P(L))$ (which may have too many edges) by $up\text{DDG}(\tilde{S})$ and $low\text{DDG}(S)$, $S \in \mathcal{S}_P$, for computing C_y as shown below. An edge $\{u, v\}$ in $ext\text{DDG}(P(L))$ represents a shortest path between u and v in $H_X(L) \setminus P(L)$. If this path is not represented by an edge in $up\text{DDG}(\tilde{S})$ or $low\text{DDG}(S)$, $S \in \mathcal{S}_P$, then the path consists of several sub-paths, each sub-path is represented by an edge in $up\text{DDG}(\tilde{S})$ or $low\text{DDG}(S)$, $S \in \mathcal{S}_P$. So, from the fact that each crest separator has $O(k)$ vertices (Property II) and the approach described in Section 2.2 of [12], it takes

$$\begin{aligned} & O((|E(P(L))| + |E(up\text{DDG}(\tilde{S}))| + |\cup_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{P}}} E(low\text{DDG}(S))|) \log^2 k) \\ = \; & O((|E(P)| + \Delta(P)k^2) \log^2 k) \end{aligned}$$

time to compute a minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle, where $\Delta(P)$ is the number of edges incident to P in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$. The time for computing minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycles for all crests $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$ is

$$\sum_{P \in V(T_{\mathcal{S}})} O((|E(P)| + \Delta(P)k^2) \log^2 k) = O((m + |\mathcal{W}_X|k^2) \log^2 k) = O(mk \log^2 k).$$

The total time for computing the face separating cycles for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ is $O(m + mk^2 + mk \log^2 k) = O(mk^2)$. □

It is easy to check that any two boundary cycles do not intersect with each other, and a boundary cycle does not intersect with a minimum separating cycle for a crest Z. However, a minimum separating cycle for one crest may intersect with a minimum separating cycle for another crest. The next lemma gives a base for eliminating intersected separating cycles.

Lemma 9 *Let C_1 be the minimum $(f_Z, f_{\overline{X}})$-separating cycle computed for crest Z and $W(C_1)$ be the set of crests in* $\text{ins}(C_1)$. *Let Z' be a crest not in $W(C_1)$ and let C_2 be the*



Figure 3: Intersected separating cycles C_1 and C_2.

minimum $(f_{Z'}, f_{\overline{X}})$*-separating cycle computed for* Z'*. If* C_1 *and* C_2 *intersect with each other, then there is a cycle* C *such that* $\mathrm{ins}(C) = \mathrm{ins}(C_1) \cup \mathrm{ins}(C_2)$ *and the length of* C *is the same as that of* C_2*.*

Proof: Assume that P_1 and P_l in the underlying tree $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ contain Z and Z', respectively. Let $\{P_1, P_2\}, \{P_2, P_3\}, ..., \{P_{l-1}, P_l\}$ be the path between P_1 and P_l in $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ and let the crest in P_i be Z_i for $1 \leq i \leq l$ ($Z = Z_1$ and $Z' = Z_l$). We claim that if $Z_i \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$ then every $Z_j \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$ for $j < i$, and if $Z_i \in \mathrm{ins}(C_2)$ then every $Z_j \in \mathrm{ins}(C_2)$ for $j > i$. To show the claim, we assume that $Z_i \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$ and there is a Z_j with $j < i$ and $Z_j \notin \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$. Let S be the crest separator of $\mathcal{S}_X$ on the edge $\{P_{j-1}, P_j\}$ of $T_{\mathcal{S}}$. We assume that Z is in the upper piece by S. Then Z_i is in the lower piece by S. From these and the fact that Z and Z_i are in $\mathrm{ins}(C_1)$, C_1 intersects at least two vertices u and v of S. Then there is an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in the *low*DDG(S) and C_1 contains the shortest path represented by the edge e. By Property (IV), $Z_j \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$, a contradiction. From this, every Z_j with $j < i$ is in $\mathrm{ins}(C_1)$. Similarly, we can prove that if $Z_i \in \mathrm{ins}(C_2)$ then every Z_j with $j > i$ is in $\mathrm{ins}(C_2)$. So the claim holds.

By the claim above, there is a Z_i, $1 \leq i < l$, such that $Z_i \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$ but $Z_j \notin \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$ for $i < j$ because $Z' \notin \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$. Let S be the crest separator on the ridge between Z_i and Z_{i+1} in the GMST (see Figure 3). We assume that Z is in the upper piece by S and Z' is in the lower piece by S. If C_1 contains an edge $e = \{x, y\}$ in *low*DDG(S) then the shortest path represented by e in the lower piece has length smaller than $l_S(x, y)$. From this, x and y are not in the same down path in S and the shortest path does not intersect with the ridge between Z_i and Z_{i+1}. From these and Property (IV), $Z_{i+1} \in \mathrm{ins}(C_1)$, a contradiction. Therefore, C_1 does not have any edge in *low*DDG(S) and intersects the ridge between Z_i and Z_{i+1}. If C_2 does not have any edge in *up*DDG(S) then $\mathrm{ins}(C_1) \cap \mathrm{ins}(C_2) = \emptyset$, a contradiction to that C_1 and C_2 intersect with each other. So, C_2 has an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in *up*DDG(S), where u and v are not in the same down path.

Let $C_2(u, v)$ be the shortest path in the upper piece by S represented by edge $e = \{u, v\}$ in *up*DDG(S). If $C_2(u, v)$ intersects C_1 at one or zero vertex then $Z \in \mathrm{ins}(C_2)$. Otherwise, let u_1 and v_1 be the first vertex and last vertex at which cycle C_2 intersects cycle C_1, respectively,

when we proceed on $C_2(u,v)$ from u to v (see Figure 3). Let $C_2(u_1,v_1)$ be the subpath of $C_2(u,v)$ connecting u_1 and v_1. Let $C_1(u_1,v_1)$ be the subpath of C_1 which connects u_1 and v_1 and intersects the ridge between Z_i and Z_{i+1}. Since the length of $C_2(u,v)$ is smaller than $l_S(u,v)$, the length of $C_2(u_1,v_1)$ is smaller than that of $C_1(u_1,v_1)$. From this, $Z \in \text{ins}(C_2)$ because otherwise, we can replace $C_1(u_1,v_1)$ with $C_2(u_1,v_1)$ to get a separating cycle for Z with a smaller length, a contradiction to that C_1 is a minimum separating cycle for Z.

For each connected region R in $\text{ins}(C_1) \setminus \text{ins}(C_2)$, the boundary of R consists of a subpath $C_1(R)$ of C_1 and a subpath $C_2(R)$ of C_2. The lengths of $C_1(R)$ and $C_2(R)$ are the same, otherwise, we can get a separating cycle for Z or Z' with length smaller than that of C_1 or C_2, respectively, a contradiction to that C_1 is a minimum separating cycle for Z and C_2 is a minimum separating cycle for Z'.

We construct the cycle C for the lemma as follows: Initially $C = C_2$. For every connected region R in $\text{ins}(C_1) \setminus \text{ins}(C_2)$, we replace $C_2(R)$ by $C_1(R)$. Then $\text{ins}(C) = \text{ins}(C_1) \cup \text{ins}(C_2)$ and has the same length as that of C_2. □

Given a set of separating cycles computed in Steps (1) and (4) in Subroutine Crest-Separator, our next job is to eliminate the intersected cycle pairs and find a good separator $\mathcal{A}_X$ for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$. The next lemma shows how to do this.

Lemma 10 *Given the set of separating cycles of length at most k computed in Steps (1) and (4) in Subroutine Crest-Separator, a good separator $\mathcal{A}_X$ for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$ can be computed in $O(|E(H_X)|)$ time.*

Proof: Let $m = |E(H_X)|$ and let Γ be the subgraph of H_X induced by the edges in all separating cycles. We orient each separating cycle C such that $\text{ins}(C)$ is on the right side when we proceed on C and give C a distinct integer label $l(C)$. We create a directed graph $\vec{\Gamma}$ consisting of all oriented edges (called arcs) in the oriented cycles. For each arc $e = (u,v)$ in $\vec{\Gamma}$, let $L(e)$ be the set of labels $l(C)$ of the oriented cycles containing e. Since each edge of H_X appears in at most two boundary cycles C_Z, there are $O(m)$ occurrences of edges in the boundary cycles C_Z for $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$ with $|C_Z| \leq k$. There are $O(|\mathcal{W}_X|k) = O((m/k)k) = O(m)$ occurrences of edges in the minimum face separating cycles for crests $Z \in \mathcal{W}_X$. Therefore, $\vec{\Gamma}$ and $L(e)$ for all arcs e can be computed in $O(m)$ time. We view Γ as an embedding of $\vec{\Gamma}$. For each face f in Γ, let $\vec{E}(f)$ be the set of arcs of $\vec{\Gamma}$ incident to f, that is, arc (u,v) of $\vec{\Gamma}$ is in $\vec{E}(f)$ if edge $\{u,v\}$ of Γ is in $E(f)$. Notice that Γ has a face f_0 such that $f_{\overline{X}}$ of H_X is a subset of f_0.

A search on arc $e = (u,v)$ means that we proceed on arc e from u to v. For arc $e = (u,v)$, let $N(e)$ be the set of arcs $e' = (v,w)$ such that e' appears in a cycle C with $l(C) \in L(e)$. For an arc $e = (u,v)$, an arc $e' = (v,w) \in N(e)$ is called the *leftmost arc* from e if when we search on e and then e', every arc of $N(e)$ other than e' is on the rightside. A seach on a seqeunce of arcs $e_1, e_2, ...$ is called a *leftmost search* if every e_{i+1} is the leftmost arc from e_i for $i \geq 1$.

We perform a leftmost search on arcs of $\vec{\Gamma}$, starting from an arc in $\vec{E}(f_0)$, to find a separating cycle C such that for any given cycle C' if $\text{ins}(C') \cap \text{ins}(C) \neq \emptyset$ then $\text{ins}(C') \subseteq$

ins(C). We call C a *maximal cycle*. According to Lemma 9 and the fact that every cycle has a length at most k, the length of C is at most k. After finding C, we update $\vec{\Gamma}$ and Γ by deleting the arcs in cycles C' from $\vec{\Gamma}$ if ins(C') $\subseteq$ ins(C) and deleting the edge $\{u, v\}$ from Γ if neither (u, v) nor (v, u) is in $\vec{\Gamma}$. We continue the search on the updated $\vec{\Gamma}$ until all arcs are deleted. Then for each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, there is a unique maximal cycle which separates Z and $\overline{X}$. Every arc will be visited in the search for at most once so the time complexity of finding all maximal cycles is $O(m)$. The total time is $O(m)$ time.

For each $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, there is a maximal cycle which separates Z and $\overline{X}$. Let A_Z be the edge subset induced by this maximal cycle. Then (1) $|\partial(A_Z)| \leq k$ (if A_Z is induced by the boundary cycle C_Z then $|\partial(A_Z)| = |C_Z| \leq k$, otherwise A_Z is induced by a maximal cycle of length at most k as shown in Lemma 9, implying $|\partial(A_Z)| \leq k$). Due to the way we find the maximal cycles above, (2) for every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_X$, there is exactly one subset $A_Z \in \mathcal{A}_X$ separating Z and $\overline{X}$; and (3) for distinct $A_Z, A_{Z'} \in \mathcal{A}_X$, $A_Z \cap A_{Z'} = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\mathcal{A}_X$ is a good-separator for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$. □

We are ready to show Theorem 3 which is re-stated below.

Theorem 5 *There is an algorithm which given a planar graph G of n vertices and an integer k, in $O(nk^2)$ time, either constructs a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2+\delta)k$ or a $(k+1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant.*

Proof: First, as shown in Lemma 10, a good separator $\mathcal{A}_X$ for $\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $\overline{X}$ is computed by Subroutine Crest-Separator. From this and as shown in the proof of Theorem 4, given a planar graph G and integer k, our algorithm computes a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(2 + \delta)k$ or a $(k + 1) \times \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ cylinder minor of G.

Let M, m_x, m be the numbers of edges in $G[\text{reach}_{G|U}(\partial(U), d_2)], (G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X, H_X$, respectively. Then $m = O(m_x)$. By Lemmas 8 and 10, Subroutine Crest-Separator takes $O(mk^2)$ time. For distinct level 1 nodes X and X', the edge sets of subgraphs $(G|\overline{X})|\mathcal{Z}_X$ and $(G|\overline{X'})|\mathcal{Z}_{X'}$ are disjoint. From this, $\sum_{X:\text{level 1 node}} m_x = O(M)$. Therefore, Step 2 of Procedure Branch-Minor($G|U$) takes $\sum_{X:\text{level 1 node}} O(m_x k^2) = O(Mk^2)$ time when Steps 2(b)(c) are replaced by Subroutine Crest_Separator.

The time for other steps in Procedure Branch-Minor($G|U$) is $O(M)$. The number of recursive calls in which each vertex of $G|U$ is involved in the computation of Step 2 is $O(\frac{1}{\alpha}) = O(1)$. Therefore, we get an algorithm with running time $O(nk^2)$. □

5 Concluding remarks

If we modify the definition for d_2 in Section 3 from $d_2 = d_1 + \lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$ to $d_2 = d_1 + (k+1)$, we get an algorithm which given a planar graph G and integer $k > 0$, in $\min\{O(n \log^3 n), O(nk^2)\}$ time either computes a branch-decomposition of G with width at most $(3+\delta)k$, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant, or a $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ cylinder minor (or grid minor). It is open whether there is

an $O(n)$ time constant factor approximation algorithm for the branchwidth and largest grid (cylinder) minors. The algorithm of this paper can be used to reduce the vertex-cut set size in the recursive division of planar graphs with small branchwidth in near linear time. It is interesting to investigate the applications of the algorithm in this paper. Such applications include to improve the efficiency of graph decomposition based algorithms for problems in planar graphs.

References

[1] S. Arnborg and D. Cornell and A. Proskurowski. Complexity of finding embedding in a k-tree. *SIAM J. Disc. Math.*8:277–284, 1987.

[2] S. Arnborg, J. Lagergren, and D. Seese. Easy problems for tree-decomposable graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 12:308–340, 1991.

[3] Z. Bian, Q.P. Gu. Computing branch decomposition of large planar graphs. In *Proc. of the 7th International Workshop on Experimental Algorithms (WEA2008)*, pages 87-100. 2008.

[4] Z. Bian, Q.P. Gu, M. Marjan, H. Tamaki and Y. Yoshitake. Empirical Study on Branchwidth and Branch Decomposition of Planar Graphs. In *Proc. of the 9th SIAM Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experimentation (ALENEX2008)*, pages 152-165. 2008.

[5] Z. Bian, Q.P. Gu and M. Zhu. Practical algorithms for branch-decompositions of planar graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, doi:10.1016/j.dam.2014.12.017, Jan. 2015.

[6] H.L. Bodlaender, P.G. Drange, M.S. Dreg, F.V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov and M. Pilipczuk. An $O(c^k n)$ 5-approximation algorithm for treewidth. In *Proc. of the 2013 Annual Symposium on Foundation of Computer Science, (FOCS2013)*, pages 499-508, 2013.

[7] H.L. Bodlaender. A tourist guide through treewidth. *Acta Cybernetica*, 11:1–21, 1993.

[8] H.L. Bodlaender. A linear time algorithm for finding tree-decomposition of small treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.* 25:1305–1317, 1996.

[9] H.L. Bodlaender, A. Grigoriev and A. M. C. A. Koster. Treewidth lower bounds with brambles. *Algorithmica.* 51(1):81–98, 2008.

[10] H.L. Bodlaender and D. Thilikos. Constructive linear time algorithm for branchwidth. In *Proc. of the 24th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, 627–637, 1997.

[11] G. Borradaile and D. Eppstein and A. Nayyenri and C. Wulff-Nilsen. All-pairs minimum cuts in near-linear time for surface-embedded graphs. arXiv:1411.7055v1, Nov. 2014.

[12] G. Borradaile and P. Sankowski and C. Wulff-Nilsen. Min *st*-cut oracle for planar graphs with near-linear preprocessing time. *ACM Trans. on Algorithms* 11(3), Article 16, Jan. 2015.

[13] E.D. Demaine and M.T. Hajiaghayi. Graphs excluding a fixed minor have grids as large as treewidth, with combinatorial and algorithmic applications through bidimensionality, In *Proc. of the 2005 Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, (SODA 2005)*, pages 682-689, 2005.

[14] F. Dorn and F.V. Fomin and M.T. Hajiaghayi and D.M. Thilikos. Subexponential parameterized algorithms on bounded-genus graphs and H-minor-free graphs, *Jour. of ACM* 52(6) pages 866-893, 2005.

[15] U. Feige, M.T. Hajiaghayi and J.R. Lee. Improved approximation algorithms for minimum weight vertex separators. *SIAM J. Comput.* 38(2): 629-657, 2008.

[16] F.V. Fomin and D.M. Thilikos. New upper bounds on the decomposability of planar graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 51(1):53–81, 2006.

[17] A. Grigoriev. Tree-width and large grid minors in planar graphs. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science.* 13(1):13–20, 2011.

[18] Q.P. Gu and H. Tamaki. Optimal branch decomposition of planar graphs in $O(n^3)$ time. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 4(3): article No.30, 1–13, 2008.

[19] Q.P. Gu and H. Tamaki. Constant-factor approximations of branch-decomposition and largest grid minor of planar graphs in $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ time. *Theoretical Computer Science* Vol. 412, pages 4100-4109, 2011.

[20] Q.P. Gu and H. Tamaki. Improved bound on the planar branchwidth with respect to the largest grid minor size. *Algorithmica*, Vol. 64 pages 416-453, 2012.

[21] Q.P. Gu and G. Xu. Near-linear time constant-factor approximation algorithm for branch-decomposition of planar graphs. In *Proc. of the 40th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, (WG2014)*, LNCS 8747, pages 238-249, 2014.

[22] I. V. Hicks. Planar branch decompositions I: The ratcatcher. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 17.4 (2005): 402-412.

[23] I. V. Hicks. Planar branch decompositions II: The cycle method. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 17.4 (2005): 413-421.

[24] F. Kammer and T. Tholey. Approximate tree decompositions of planar graphs in linear time. In *Proc. of the 2012 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA2012)*, 683–698, pages 2012.

[25] F. Kammer and T. Tholey. Approximate tree decompositions of planar graphs in linear time. *arXiv:1104.2275v2*, May 2013

[26] S. Mozes and C. Sommer. Exact distance oracles for planar graphs In *Proc. of the 2012 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, (SODA 2012)*, pages 209-222, 2012.

[27] J.H. Reif. minimum s-t cut of a planar undirected network in $O(n \log^2 n)$ time. planar graphs in linear time. *SIAM J. on Computing*, 12(1): pages 71-81, 1983

[28] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph minors X. Obstructions to tree decomposition. *J. of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 52:153–190, 1991.

[29] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph minors XIII. The disjoint paths problem. *of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 63:65–110, 1995.

[30] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour and R. Thomas. Quickly excluding a planar graph *J. of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 62:323–348, 1994.

[31] P.D. Seymour and R. Thomas. Call routing and the ratcatcher. *Combinatorica*, 14(2):217–241, 1994.

[32] J. C. Smith, E. Ulusal, and I. V. Hicks. A combinatorial optimization algorithm for solving the branchwidth problem. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 51.3 (2012): 1211-1229.

[33] H. Tamaki. A linear time heuristic for the branch-decomposition of planar graphs. In *Proc. of ESA2003* 765–775, 2003.

[34] M. Thorup. Undirected single-source shortest paths with positive integer weights in linear time. *Journal of the ACM*, 46(3):362–394, 1999.